A U M

Through the power of Mind Life comes into this body.—*Prashna Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIII **February, 1955** **No. 4**

ABSTRACTIONS AND APPLICATIONS

IT is natural to wonder, from time to time, about the way in which the spread of theosophical influence may be expected to affect the world for good, and eventually bring to realization the almost utopian vision of the future described on the closing page of the *Key to Theosophy*. To begin with a certain optimism is possible simply on logical grounds. An inevitable effect of acceptance of the ideas of Karma and Reincarnation will be the reduction of animosities between the peoples of different nations and races. The habit of seeking a "scapegoat" for national ills and domestic insecurities can hardly be pursued by those who become convinced that their circumstances, however uncomfortable, are of their own making. Again, Karma and Reincarnation are tremendously liberating so far as the authority of orthodox religious institutions is concerned. The idea of a "created being," answerable to his "Creator," can hardly survive the evolutionary philosophy involved in the teaching of the reincarnating ego.

Most of all, perhaps, is the idea of universal brotherhood supported by the conviction that human souls evolve through reincarnation under the law of moral equilibrium. Brotherhood is violated, not so much by the evil intentions of man as by actions which spring from fear. First we fear others, and then, having in effect cast them out of our universe, to take action against them no longer appears "unbrotherly." It seems reasonable to us to suppose that they constitute an exception to the law of brotherhood. But if we can overcome fear, we shall be able to include everyone within the circle of our friendly regard. This may not eliminate the actual evil in the world, but if we could dispense

with only the *supposed* evil, we might be far closer to a realization of universal brotherhood than we now suspect.

These are conclusions which result from the ethical logic of theosophical teachings. Given truer ideas concerning the nature of man, there would be a strengthening of the moral fibre, and with this "deeper realization of the self" would come a regeneration, producing revolutionary effects at all levels of human relationships.

What is not so evident is the means by which the necessary convictions will come to be adopted. While the world is girdled by small groups of earnest Theosophists, laboring mightily to keep these saving ideas before the public, it can hardly be denied that very few, out of a population of hundreds of millions, come into actual, intimate touch with Theosophical ideas. And even when the larger leavening process is added—the influence of movements and people who are tinged with the coloring, if not the principles, of Theosophy—there is still what seems a tremendous abyss between the present role of the Movement and the goal which lies so far ahead.

At least two important considerations are left out of the foregoing analysis. First, there is the independent power of philosophical ideas, set loose "in the air," as it were, by the work of students. No one, of course, can measure this influence, but the continuous coverage in the Lookout department of this Magazine of the inclination of many avenues of modern thought in a Theosophical direction provides an accounting of a sort. Theosophists cannot exactly "claim" to be responsible for this progress; the credit, in fact, wherever it should go, is unimportant; what is worth noting is the fact of this broad trend, and that it seems to be increasing with the years.

Second is the consideration that we are unable to foresee the *karmic* changes which may overtake the world during the next forty or fifty years. Who, for example, would have been able in the early years of the nineteenth century to predict what H. P. Blavatsky later called a "crisis" in the affairs of men—the flood of spiritualistic phenomena which began in 1848? And it was only one like H.P.B.—versed in the significance of this psychic outburst—who could understand its importance to the destiny of the race. The Spiritualist storm broke over a fairly complacent world, a world confident of its knowledge, proud of its authorities in science, and practically smug in its sense of superiority over past civilizations. It is to be noted, that the Theosophical Movement made its way in spite of conceit and complacency.

Whatever may be said of the present, it is certainly not complacent. The world is filled with anxieties and sore fears of the future. While the nineteenth century felt quite "adequate," the people of the nations of today are no longer confident of either their rulers or the prevailing faiths. Here, then, is the first requirement of susceptibility to change. It might even be said that the danger is not so much that people will be unable to entertain new thoughts, but that the changes, when their hour arrives, will come so furiously that control of their direction will be exceedingly difficult. The prediction of H. P. Blavatsky's Five Messages relates more to the plastic responsiveness of the psychic nature than to the resistance of materialism and prejudice.

In an article concerned with the future, William Q. Judge writes of a time when power will be needed, and pretensions will count for nought. This had to do with the emergence of adepts. For our own purposes, the expression might be paraphrased to read that the time may be fairly close when stability will be needed and words will count for nought. As the old faiths die and their accompanying securities melt away, an almost inevitable hysteria may be expected. There will be many, perhaps, who will in their extremity be beyond the reach of sweet reasonableness, but who will sense in those who do not lose their balance the kind of foundation for which they long. Here may be an important means of assistance Theosophists can afford to their fellows. In many ways, perhaps, the coming years will be marked by salvage operations. H.P.B. spoke of the fact that the time will come when the psychologists will have some extra work to do; there is already evidence of philosophical preparation in the field of psychology, giving reassuring confirmation of H.P.B.'s prophecy. Her scant "political" predictions are now in process of fulfillment, although the end is far from clear. But whatever the future holds, it is certain that the role of students of Theosophy will make increasing demand of applications, if only because the familiar ways and customs are breaking down, and people will be looking desperately about for clues to a stable existence.

It is of course natural that Theosophy affords no detailed outline of the needs of the future. Students of Theosophy are in the way of becoming self-reliant philosophers, and it is a requirement of the philosopher that he get along without blueprints, learning to become sensitive to the needs of his time and to apply what he knows in the manner that is appropriate. Responsibilities of this sort are at once the test of the student and the vindication of the philosophy.

MY BOOKS

SOME time ago, a Theosophist, Mr. R***, was traveling by rail with an American gentleman, who told him how surprised he had been by his visit to our London Headquarters. He said that he had asked Mdme. Blavatsky what were the best Theosophical works for him to read, and had declared his intention of procuring *Isis Unveiled,* when to his astonishment she replied, "Don't read it, *it is all trash.*"

Now I did not say "trash" so far as I remember; but what I did say in substance was: "Leave it alone; *Isis* will not satisfy you. Of all the books I have put my name to, this particular one is, in literary arrangement, the worst and most confused." And I might have added with as much truth that, carefully analysed from a strictly literary and critical standpoint, *Isis* was full of misprints and misquotations; that it contained useless repetitions, most irritating digressions, and to the casual reader unfamiliar with the various aspects of metaphysical ideas and symbols, as many apparent contradictions; that much of the matter in it ought not to be there at all and also that it had some very gross mistakes due to the many alterations in proof-reading in general, and word corrections in particular. Finally, that the work, for reasons that will be now explained, has no system in it; and that it looks in truth, as remarked by a friend, as if a mass of independent paragraphs having no connection with each other, had been well shaken up in a waste-basket, and then taken out at random and—published.

Such is also now my sincere opinion. The full consciousness of this sad truth dawned upon me when, for the first time after its publication in 1877, I read the work through from the first to the last page, in India in 1881. And from that date to the present, I have never ceased to say what I thought of it, and to give my honest opinion of *Isis* whenever I had an opportunity for so doing. This was done to the great disgust of some, who warned me that I was spoiling its sale; but as my chief object in writing it was neither personal fame nor gain, but something far higher, I cared little for such warnings. For more than ten years this unfortunate "master-piece," this "monumental work," as some reviews have called it, with its hideous metamorphoses of one word

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for May, 1891, and was reprinted in THEOSOPHY 2: 340.

into another, thereby entirely transforming the meaning,† with its misprints and wrong quotation-marks, has given me more anxiety and trouble than anything else during a long life-time which has ever been more full of thorns than of roses.

But in spite of these perhaps too great admissions, I maintain that *Isis Unveiled* contains a mass of original and never hitherto divulged information on occult subjects. That this is so, is proved by the fact that the work has been fully appreciated by all those who have been intelligent enough to discern the kernel, and pay little attention to the shell, to give the preference to the idea and not to the form, regardless of its minor shortcomings. Prepared to take upon myself—*vicariously* as I will show—the sins of all the external, purely literary defects of the work, I defend the ideas and teachings in it, with no fear of being charged with conceit, since *neither ideas nor teaching are mine,* as I have always declared; and I maintain that both are of the greatest value to mystics and students of Theosophy. So true is this, that when *Isis* was first published, some of the best American papers were lavish in its praise—even to exaggeration, as is evidenced by the quotations below.*

The first enemies that my work brought to the front were Spiritualists, whose fundamental theories as to the spirits of the dead communicating in *propriâ personâ* I upset. For the last fifteen years—ever since this first publication—an incessant shower of ugly accusations has been poured upon me. Every libellous charge, from immorality and the "Russian spy" theory down to my acting on false pretenses, of being a chronic fraud and *a living lie,* an habitual drunkard, an emissary of the Pope, paid to break down Spiritualism, and Satan incarnate. Every slander that can be thought of has been brought to bear upon my private and public life. The fact *that not a single one of these charges*

---

† Witness the word "planet" for "cycle" as originally written, corrected by some unknown hand, (Vol. I, p. 347, 2nd par.), a "correction" which shows Buddha teaching that there *is no rebirth on this planet* (!!) when the contrary is asserted on p. 346, and the Lord Buddha is said to teach how to "avoid" *reincarnation;* the use of the word "planet," for *plane,* or "Monas" for *Manas;* and the sense of whole ideas sacrificed to the grammatical form, and changed by the substitution of wrong words and erroneous punctuation, etc., etc., etc.

**Isis Unveiled;* a master key to the mysteries of ancient and modern science and theology. By H. P. Blavatsky, Corresponding Secretary of the Theosophical Society, 2 vols., royal 8vo., about 1,500 pages, cloth, $7.50. Fifth Edition.

"This monumental work . . . about everything relating to magic, mystery, witchcraft, religion, spiritualism, which would be valuable in an encyclopaedia."—*North American Review.*

"It must be acknowledged that she is a remarkable woman, who has read more, seen more, and thought more than most wise men. Her work abounds in quotations from a dozen different languages, not for the purpose of a vain display of erudition, but to sub-

has ever been substantiated; that from the first day of January to the last of December, year after year, I have lived surrounded by friends and foes like as in a glass-house,—nothing could stop these wicked, venomous, and thoroughly unscrupulous tongues. It has been said at various times by my ever-active opponents that (1) *Isis Unveiled* was simply a rehash of Éliphas Lévi and a few old alchemists: (2) that it was written by me under the dictation of Evil Powers and the *departed spirits* of Jesuits (*sic*); and finally (3) that my two volumes had been compiled from *mss.* (never before heard of), which Baron de Palm —he of the cremation and double-burial fame—had left behind him, and which I had found in his trunk!* On the other hand, friends, as unwise as they were kind, spread abroad that which was really the truth,

---

stantiate her peculiar views . . . her pages are garnished with foot-notes establishing, as her authorities, some of the profoundest writers of the past. To a large class of readers, this remarkable work will prove of absorbing interest . . . demands the earnest attention of thinkers, and merits an analytic reading."—*Boston Evening Transcript.*

"The appearance of erudition is stupendous. Reference to and quotations from the most unknown and obscure writers in all languages abound, interspersed with allusions to writers of the highest repute, which have evidently been more than skimmed through." —*N.Y. Independent.*

"An extremely readable and exhaustive essay upon the paramount importance of re-establishing the Hermetic Philosophy in a world which blindly believes that it has outgrown it."—*N. Y. World.*

"Most remarkable book of the season."—*Com. Advertiser.*

"Readers who have never made themselves acquainted with the literature of mysticism and alchemy, the volume will furnish the materials for an interesting study—a mine of curious information."—*Evening Post.*

"They give evidence of much and multifarious research on the part of the author, and contain a vast number of interesting stories. Persons fond of the marvellous will find in them an abundance of entertainment."—*New York Sun.*

"A marvellous book both in matter and manner of treatment. Some idea may be formed of the rarity and extent of its contents when the index alone comprises fifty pages, and we venture nothing in saying that such an index of subjects was never before compiled by any human being. . . . But the book is a curious one and will no doubt find its way into libraries because of the unique subject matter it contains . . . will certainly prove attractive to all who are interested in the history, theology, and the mysteries of the ancient world."—*Daily Graphic.*

"The present work is the fruit of her remarkable course of education, and amply confirms her claims to the character of an adept in secret science, and even to the rank of a hierophant in the exposition of its mystic lore."—*New York Tribune.*

"One who reads the book carefully through, ought to know everything of the marvellous and mystical, except perhaps, the passwords. *Isis* will supplement the *Anacalypsis.* Whoever loves to read Godfrey Higgins will be delighted with Mme. Blavatsky. There is a great resemblance between their works. Both have tried hard to tell everything apocryphal and apocalyptic. It is easy to forecast the reception of this book. With its striking peculiarities, its audacity, its versatility, and the prodigious variety of subjects which it notices and handles, it is one of the remarkable productions of the century."—*New York Herald.*

* This Austrian nobleman, who was in complete destitution at New York, and to whom Colonel Olcott had given shelter and food, nursing him during the last weeks of his life—left nothing in MS. behind him but bills. The only effect of the baron was an old valise, in which his "executors" found a battered bronze Cupid, a few foreign Orders (imitations in pinchbeck and paste, as the gold and diamonds had been sold); and a few shirts of Colonel Olcott's, which the ex-diplomat had annexed without permission.

a little too enthusiastically, about the connection of my Eastern Teacher and other Occultists with the work; and this was seized upon by the enemy and exaggerated out of all limits of truth. It was said that the whole of *Isis* had been dictated to me *from cover to cover* and *verbatim* by these invisible Adepts. And, as the imperfections of my work were only too glaring, the consequence of all this idle and malicious talk was, that my enemies and critics inferred—as well they might—that either these invisible inspirers had no existence, and were part of my "fraud," or that they lacked the cleverness of even an average good writer.

Now, no one has any right to hold me responsible for what any one may say, but only for that which I myself state orally, or in public print over my signature. And what I say and maintain is this: Save the direct quotations and the many afore specified and mentioned misprints, errors and misquotations, and the general make-up of *Isis Unveiled,* for which I am in no way responsible, (*a*) every word of information found in this work or in my later writings, comes from the teachings of our Eastern Masters; and (*b*) that many a passage in these works has been written by me *under their dictation.* In saying this no *supernatural* claim is urged, for no *miracle* is performed by such a dictation. Any moderately intelligent person, convinced by this time of the many possibilities of hypnotism (now accepted by science and under full scientific investigation), and of the phenomena of *thought-transference,* will easily concede that if even a hypnotized subject, a mere irresponsible medium, *hears the unexpressed thought* of his hypnotizer, who can thus transfer his thought to him—*even to repeating the words read by the hypnotizer mentally from a book*—then my claim has nothing impossible in it. Space and distance do not exist for thought; and if two persons are in perfect mutual psycho-magnetic *rapport,* and of these two, one is a great Adept in Occult Sciences, then thought-transference and dictation of whole pages, become as easy and as comprehensible at the distance of ten thousand miles as the transference of two words across a room.

Hitherto, I have abstained—except on very rare occasions—from answering any criticism on my works, and have even left direct slanders and lies unrefuted, because in the case of *Isis* I found almost every kind of criticism justifiable, and in that of "slanders and lies," my contempt for the slanderers was too great to permit me to notice them. Especially was it the case with regard to the libellous matter emanating from America. It has all come from one and the same source, well

known to all Theosophists, a *person* most indefatigable in attacking me personally for the last twelve years.† though I have never seen or met the creature. Neither do I intend to answer him now. But, as *Isis* is now attacked for at least the tenth time, the day has come when my perplexed friends and that portion of the public which may be in sympathy with Theosophy, are entitled to the whole truth—*and nothing but the truth.* Not that I seek to excuse myself in anything even before them or to "explain things." It is nothing of the kind. What I am determined to do is to give *facts,* undeniable and not to be gainsaid, simply by stating the peculiar, well known to many but now almost forgotten circumstances, under which I wrote my first English work. I give them *seriatim.*

(1). When I came to America in 1873, I had not spoken English—which I had learned in my childhood colloquially—for over thirty years. I could understand when I read it, but could hardly speak the language.

(2). I had never been at any college, and what I knew I had taught myself; I have never pretended to any scholarship in the sense of modern research; I had then hardly read any scientific European works, knew little of Western philosophy and sciences. The little which I had studied and learned of these, disgusted me with its materialism, its limitations, narrow cut-and-dried spirit of dogmatism, and its air of superiority over the philosophies and sciences of antiquity.

(3). Until 1874 I had never written one word in English, nor had I published any work in any language. Therefore—

(4). I had not the least idea of literary rules. The art of writing books, of preparing them for print and publication, reading and correcting proofs, were so many closed secrets to me.

(5). When I started to write that which developed later into *Isis Unveiled,* I had no more idea than the man in the moon what would come of it. I had no plan; did not know whether it would be an essay, a pamphlet, a book, or an article. I knew that *I had to write it,* that was all. I began the work before I knew Colonel Olcott well, and some months before the formation of the Theosophical Society.

Thus, the conditions for becoming the author of an English theosophical and scientific work were hopeful, as everyone will see. Never-

† I will not name him. There are names which carry a moral stench about them, unfit for any decent journal or publication. His words and deeds emanate from the *cloaca maxima* of the Universe of matter and have to return to it, without touching me.

theless, I had written enough to fill four such volumes as *Isis,* before I submitted my work to Colonel Olcott. Of course he said that everything save the pages dictated—had to be rewritten. Then we started on our literary labours and worked together every evening. Some pages the English of which he had corrected, I copied; others which would yield to no mortal correction, he used to read aloud from my pages, Englishing them verbally as he went on, dictating to me from my almost undecipherable *mss.* It is to him that I am indebted for the English in *Isis.* It is he again who suggested that the work should be divided into chapters, and the first volume devoted to SCIENCE and the second to THEOLOGY. To do this, the matter had to be re-shifted, and many of the chapters also; repetition had to be erased, and the literary connection of subjects attended to. When the work was ready, we submitted it to Professor Alexander Wilder, the well-known scholar and Platonist of New York, who after reading the matter, recommended it to Mr. Bouton for publication. Next to Colonel Olcott, it is Professor Wilder who did the most for me. It is he who made the excellent *Index,* who corrected the Greek, Latin and Hebrew words, suggested quotations and wrote the greater part of the *Introduction* "Before the Veil." If this was not acknowledged in the work, the fault is not mine, but because it was Dr. Wilder's express wish that his name should not appear except in footnotes. I have never made a secret of it, and every one of my numerous acquaintances in New York knew it. When ready the work went to press.

From that moment the real difficulty began. I had no idea of correcting galley-proofs; Colonel Olcott had little leisure to do so; and the result was that I made a mess of it from the beginning. Before we were through with the first three chapters, there was a bill for six hundred dollars for corrections and alterations, and I had to give up the proof-reading. Pressed by the publisher, Colonel Olcott doing all that he possibly could do, but having no time except in the evenings, and Dr. Wilder far away at Jersey City, the result was that the proofs and pages of *Isis* passed through a number of willing but not very careful hands, and were finally left to the tender mercies of the publisher's proof-reader. Can one wonder after this if "Vaivaswata" (Manu) became transformed in the published volumes into "Viswamitra," that thirty-six pages of the Index were irretrievably lost, and quotation-marks placed where none were needed (as in some of my own sentences!), and left out entirely in many a passage cited from various

authors? If asked why these fatal mistakes have not been corrected in a subsequent edition, my answer is simple: the plates were stereotyped; and notwithstanding all my desire to do so, I could not put it into practice, as the plates were the property of the publisher; I had no money to pay for the expenses, and finally the firm was quite satisfied to let things be as they are, since, notwithstanding all its glaring defects, the work—which has now reached its seventh or eighth edition, is still in demand.

And now—and perhaps in consequence of all this—comes a new accusation: I am charged *with wholesale plagiarism* in the Introductory Chapter "Before the Veil!"

Well, had I committed plagiarism, I should not feel the slightest hesitation in admitting the "borrowing." But all "parallel passages" to the contrary, as I have not done so, I do not see why I should confess it; even though "thought transference" as the *Pall Mall Gazette* wittily calls it, is in fashion, and at a premium just now. Since the day when the American press raised a howl against Longfellow, who, borrowing from some (then) unknown German translation of the Finnish epic, the *Kalevala,* published it as his own superb poem, *Hiawatha,* and forgot to acknowledge the source of his inspiration, the Continental press has repeatedly brought out other like accusations. The present year is especially fruitful in such "thought transferences." Here we have the Lord Mayor of the City of London, repeating word for word an old forgotten sermon by Mr. Spurgeon and swearing he had never read or heard of it. The Rev. Robert Bradlaugh writes a book, and forthwith the *Pall Mall Gazette* denounces it as a verbal copy from somebody else's work. Mr. Harry de Windt, the Oriental traveller, and a F.R.G.S. to boot, finds several pages out of his just published *A Ride to India, across Persia and Beluchistan,* in the London *Academy* paralleled with extracts from *The Country of Belochistan,* by A. W. Hughes, which are identical *verbatim et literatim.* Mrs. Parr denies in the *British Weekly* that her novel *Sally* was borrowed consciously or unconsciously from Miss Wilkins' *Sally,* and states that she had never read the said story, nor even heard the author's name, and so on. Finally, every one who has read *La Vie de Jésus,* by Renan, will find that he has plagiarized by *anticipation,* some descriptive passages rendered in flowering verse in the *Light of the World.* Yet even Sir Edwin Arnold, whose versatile and recognized genius needs no borrowed imagery, has failed to thank the French Academician for his pictures of Mount Tabor and

Galilee in prose, which he has so elegantly versified in his last poem. Indeed, at this stage of our civilization and *fin de siècle,* one should feel highly honoured to be placed in such good and numerous company, even as a—plagiarist. But I cannot claim such a privilege and, simply for the reason already told that out of the whole Introductory chapter "Before the Veil," I can claim as my own only certain passages in the Glossary appended to it, the Platonic portion of it, that which is now denounced as "a bare-faced plagiarism" having been written by Professor A. Wilder.

That gentleman is still living in or near New York, and can be asked whether my statement is true or not. He is too honourable, too great a scholar, to deny or fear anything. He insisted upon a kind of *Glossary,* explaining the Greek and Sanskrit names and words with which the work abounds, being appended to an introduction, and furnished a few himself. I begged him to give me a short summary of the Platonic philosophers, which he kindly did. Thus from p. 11 down to 22 the text is his, save a few intercalated passages which break the Platonic narrative, to show the identity of ideas in the Hindu Scriptures. Now who of those who know Dr. A. Wilder personally, or by name, who are aware of the great scholarship of that eminent Platonist, the editor of so many learned works,* would be insane enough to accuse *him* of "plagiarising" from any author's work! I give in the footnote the names of a few of the Platonic and other works he has edited. The charge would be simply preposterous!

The fact is that Dr. Wilder must have either forgotten to place quotes before and after the passages copied by him from various authors in his Summary; or else, owing to his very difficult handwriting, he has failed to mark them with sufficient clearness. It is impossible, after the lapse of almost fifteen years, to remember or verify the facts. To this day I had imagined that this disquisition on the Platonists was his, and never gave a further thought to it. But now enemies have ferreted

* A. Wilder, M.D., the editor of *Serpent and Siva Worship,* by Hyde Clarke and C. Staniland Wake; of *Ancient Art and Mythology,* by Richard Payne Knight, to which the editor has appended an Introduction, Notes translated into English and a new and complete Index; of *Ancient Symbol Worship,* by Hodder M. Westropp and C. Staniland Wake, with an Introduction, additional Notes and Appendix by the editor; and finally, of *The Eleusinian and Bacchic Mysteries;* "A Dissertation, by Thomas Taylor, translator of 'Plato,' 'Plotinus,' 'Porphyry,' 'Jamblichus,' 'Proclus,' 'Aristotle' etc., etc.," edited with Introduction, Notes, Emendations, and Glossary, by Alexander Wilder, M.D.; and the author of various learned works, pamphlets and articles for which we have no space here. Also the editor of the "Older Academy," a quarterly journal of New York, and the translator of the *Mysteries,* by Jamblichus.

out unquoted passages and proclaim louder than ever "the author of *Isis Unveiled,*" to be a plagiarist and a fraud. Very likely more may be found, as that work is an inexhaustible mine of misquotations, errors and blunders, to which it is impossible for me to plead "guilty" in the ordinary sense. Let then the slanderers go on, only to find in another fifteen years as they have found in the preceding period, that whatever they do, *they cannot ruin Theosophy, nor even hurt me.* I have no author's vanity; and years of unjust persecution and abuse have made me entirely callous to what the public may think of me—personally.

But in view of the facts as given above; and considering that—

(*a*) The language in *Isis* is not mine; but (with the exception of that portion of the work which, as I claim, was *dictated*), may be called only a sort of translation of my facts and ideas into English;

(*b*) It was not written for the public,—the latter having always been only a secondary consideration with me—but for the use of Theosophists and members of the Theosophical Society to which *Isis* is dedicated;

(*c*) Though I have since learned sufficient English to have been enabled to edit two magazines—the *Theosophist* and LUCIFER—yet, to the present hour I never write an article, an editorial or even a simple paragraph, without submitting its English to close scrutiny and correction.

Considering all this and much more, I ask now every impartial and honest man and woman whether it is just or even fair to criticize my works—*Isis,* above all others—as one would the writings of a born American or English author! What I claim in them as my own is only the fruit of my learning and studies in a department, hitherto left uninvestigated by Science, and almost unknown to the European world. I am perfectly willing to leave the honour of the English grammar in them, the glory of the quotations from scientific works brought occasionally to me to be used as passages for comparison with, or refutation by, the old Science, and finally the general makeup of the volumes, to every one of those who have helped me. Even for the *Secret Doctrine* there are about half-a-dozen Theosophists who have been busy in editing it, who have helped me to arrange the matter, correct the imperfect English, and prepare it for print. But that which none of them will ever claim from first to last, is the fundamental doctrine, the philosophical conclusions and teachings. Nothing of that have I

invented, but simply given it out as I have been taught; or as quoted by me in the *Secret Doctrine* (Vol. I, p. 46) from Montaigne: "I have here made only a nosegay of culled (Eastern) flowers, and have brought nothing of my own but the string that ties them."

Is any one of my helpers prepared to say that I have not paid the full price for the string?

H. P. BLAVATSKY

A DECLARATION

We, the undersigned Fellows of the Theosophical Society (and members of the Inner Group of the E.S.), at the stake of our personal honour and reputation, hereby declare:

That we have fully investigated all the accusations and attacks which have been made against the personal character and *bona fides* of H. P. Blavatsky, and have found them in the vast majority of cases to be entirely false, and in the few remaining instances the grossest possible distortions of the simple facts.

Knowing moreover, that accusations of plagiarism, want of method and inaccuracy, are now being made and will in the future be brought against her literary work, we make the following statement for the benefit of all Fellows of the Theosophical Society and for the information of others:

H. P. Blavatsky's writings, owing to her imperfect knowledge of English and literary methods, have been invariably revised, recopied or arranged in MS., and the proofs corrected, by the nearest "friends" available for the time being (a few of whom have occasionally supplied her with references, quotations, and advice). Many mistakes, omissions, inaccuracies, &c., have consequently crept into them.

These works, however, have been put forward purely with the intention of bringing certain *ideas* to the notice of the Western world, and with no pretension on her part to scholarship or literary finish.

In order to support these views, innumerable quotations and references had to be made (in many cases without the possibility of verification by her), and for these she has never claimed any originality or profound research whatever.

After long and intimate acquaintance with H. P. Blavatsky, we have invariably found her labouring for the benefit and instruction of the Theosophical Society and others, and not for herself, and that she is the first to make little of what others may consider her "learning."

From further instruction however, which we have received, we know for a fact that H. P. Blavatsky is the possessor of far deeper "knowledge" than even that which she has been able to give out in her public writings.

From all of which considerations, it logically follows that no accusations can possibly shake our confidence in H. P. Blavatsky's personal character and *bona fides* as a teacher. We do not therefore intend in future to waste our time in useless refutations, or allow ourselves to be distracted from our work by any attacks, further than to repeat our present statement.

We, however, reserve to ourselves the right of appeal to the law, when necessary.

G. R. S. Mead,
W. R. Old,
Laura M. Cooper,
Emily Kislingbury,
E. T. Sturdy,
H. A. W. Coryn,
Constance Wachtmeister,
Alice Leighton Cleather,
Claude F. Wright,
Archibald Keightley,
Isabel Cooper-Oakley,
Annie Besant.

ART AND SCIENCE

A multitude of observations have been made on the behavior of man towards man. The greatest contribution is still that of the inspired poets and prose writers; intuition still plays a great part even with the most careful psychological investigator of human relationships.

Poets are always years, if not centuries, ahead of scientists. They see and understand what goes on; the scientist labors along in the rear, trying to explain why it goes on. . . . Scientific bits are laboriously discovered over the years until at last a partly fitted mosaic gives a clue to the nature of the whole picture. The poet sees the essentials in a flash and puts them into a form that makes others feel their truth and importance. It is when he "strikes to the heart of things" and says so in some universal symbolism that the poet lives.

—STANLEY COBB

THE GITA AND THE BIBLE

WHATEVER one's creed may be, a religiously-minded person need never fear that his positive faith will suffer, or in any way be injured, by contact with Theosophy, the ancient Wisdom Religion. Theosophy is not in the world to destroy, but to build. Students of H. B. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* soon make the discovery that all the world's religions, as also the numberless creeds and sects that have branched off from them, have sprung from a common Source. What then is more logical than that the original beliefs underlying these creeds should likewise have their root in a common basis of knowledge? It would be difficult to find a single symbol in the Christian Bible the psychological counterpart of which cannot be discovered also in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* just as it would be almost impossible to find a basic tenet in Buddhism or Hinduism that cannot be found in essence in *The Secret Doctrine* or *The Ocean of Theosophy.* And, being the essence of all true religion, Theosophy alone is calculated to withstand the attacks of materialism upon man's sacred beliefs.

The fundamental spiritual truths of life are few in number, and these will be found to exist, either in pure or diluted form, in every religious philosophy worthy of the name. If the Christian heaven and hell seem to differ, for example, from the Hindu devachan and kama-loka, or if the Zoroastrian Ahura Mazda, God of Light, differs from the Buddhist Adi-Buddha, or the Chinese Tao, it is only because of differing temperaments of the people to whom these truths were revealed. Unless a nation be composed entirely of saints and sages, which unfortunately none of the historical nations were or are, it is not likely that the primeval spiritual wisdom, upon reaching the minds of the people, will long remain pure and undefiled. Every great philosophy has suffered at the hands of time and transmission. A dogma held by people in Western lands oftentimes bears little resemblance, outwardly, to the Eastern interpretation of the same idea—though the two teachings stem undoubtedly from a common root-type of doctrine. Herein lies the need of furthering the work of the Second Object of the present Theosophical Movement: namely, the study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies and sciences, and the demonstration of the importance of such study—as a step toward the accomplishment

of the First Object, which is to bring about among all men a realization of Universal Brotherhood.

It should prove an interesting experiment, in this respect, to compare the Western teaching of God, as expressed in the Old and New Testaments, with the Oriental ideas on the subject, as expounded by Krishna in *The Bhagavad-Gita.* For however antagonistic the teachings may appear in theory and belief, and however dissimilar the practices that result therefrom, it is clear, at least to students of esoteric philosophy, that portions of the two can be reconciled—and this with benefit to all concerned.

In pursuing a study of this kind, however, a warning is necessary. *Words* are utterly inadequate to express high metaphysical thoughts and ideas, just as the human mind as presently constituted is utterly incapable of grasping ultimate truth. Great religious teachers, in their reference to and consideration of Deity, never intended their words to be looked upon as full *definitions*—least of all as finalities. Words, they say, are only aids or ladders by which the intuitive mind, if at all spiritual in its make-up, may rise above the expression, and thus gain a glimpse of THAT which is nameless and indefinable. Terms such as God, Lord, Spirit and Deity, and those even of Krishna, Buddha and Christ, however highly they may have been or may be interpreted, are not capable of expressing fully the ideas they represent. None of these terms should be given hard and fast definitions, lest the person hearing them spoken or reading them imagine he knows all that is contained in the idea. Room should be left for wider and deeper understanding, an ever-growing perception and realization, as the finite reaches Godward toward the infinite. Failure to heed this warning and to strive ever for greater meanings behind the words has led men of all times and nations into materialization of concepts, with the result, especially in Western lands, that God has become degraded into a limited, personalized Being, with qualities and attributes similar to, and in many cases no better than, those possessed by ordinary men.

The key best calculated to open the door leading to the mystery of Deity, and at the same time break the molds of misconception that have formed in the minds of men, is that of the Trinity. The ONE, so far as the human mind is concerned, can never be comprehended except from the point of view of the three, the five, the seven, etc. And the grand pantheistic ideal of (1) the Unknown and Unknowable Essence being transformed into (2) subjective, and then into (3) objective matter,

is at the root of all these triads and triplets. Thus we have in the various systems:

(1)	(2)	(3)
The Unknowable Essence	Subjective Matter	Objective Matter
Spirit	Soul	Body
Adi-Buddha, or Primordial Universal Wisdom	The Dhyani-Buddhas, or Bodhisattvas	The Manushi, or Human Buddhas - Gautama
Ahura Mazda	Ormuzd	Zoroaster
Atman, the Supreme Spirit	Isvara, the Divine Ego	Krishna, the man in Human Form
God, the Father in Heaven	Christ, the First Born	Jesus, the meek carpenter and fisherman

Following the pattern of this threefold classification, Krishna, in the *Gita,* is referred to as (1) "the Supreme Spirit of this universe . . . unborn, of changeless essence," (2) "the supreme inexhaustible Being . . . the never-failing guardian of eternal law . . . the Ego which is seated in the hearts of all beings," and (3) the man "in human form," charioteer, companion and friend of his devoted disciple, Arjuna. It is not until the eleventh chapter, when Arjuna reaches the stage of development where his divine eye can be opened that he gains a true vision of the stature, nature and dignity of his Teacher and Master.

In the Bible, the expressions used with respect to the Highest differ very little from the terms employed millenniums earlier by Vyasa, Krishna and Arjuna. Students of the *Gita* will recall that in Chapter II, Atman, the Supreme Spirit, is said to be "without birth and meeteth not death; it is ancient, constant, and eternal. . . . The weapon divideth it not, the fire burneth it not, the water corrupteth it not, the wind drieth it not away; for it is indivisible, inconsumable, incorruptible, and is not to be dried away: it is eternal, universal, permanent, immovable; it is invisible, inconceivable, and unalterable . . ." By comparing these statements with the following drawn from the Old and New Testaments, it will be seen that there, too, God the Spirit is spoken of as being unsearchable, eternal, incorruptible, immutable, invisible, immortal, changeless, omnipresent, etc., etc.:

> The eternal God is your dwelling place. (Deu. 33.27.)
> Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is to come. (Rev. 4.8-9.)
> Have you not known? Have you not heard? The Lord is the everlasting God . . . (Isa. 40.28.)

> No one has ever seen God. (John 1.18.)
>
> His voice you have never heard, his form you have never seen. (John 5.37.)
>
> For I the Lord do not change. (Mal. 3.6.)
>
> Behold, I go forward, but he is not there; and backward, but I cannot perceive him; on the left hand I seek him, but I cannot behold him; I turn to the right hand, but I cannot see him. (Job 23.8-9.)
>
> . . . the King of kings and the Lord of lords, who alone has immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, whom no man has ever seen or can see. (1 Tim. 6.15-16.)
>
> Claiming to be wise, they became fools, and exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal man or birds or animals or reptiles. (Rom. 1.22-23.)
>
> Can you find out the deep things of God? Can you find out the limit of the Almighty? It is higher than heaven - what can you do? Deeper than Sheol - what can you know? Its measure is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. (Job 11.7-9.)

To every student of comparative religions, it is evident that the God here referred to is the Unknown and Unknowable Essence of the Pantheists, the Ain-Soph of the Western Kabalists, postulation of which constitutes the First Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine.* How, in the light of the above statements, the Highest Deity could have become degraded into a personal Being, is one of the mysteries of the human mind. Might it be that the mystery is due to loss or failure to use the threefold Key? Is it possible that Christians, reading the words of Jesus, and Jews, those of Moses, fail to realize the true nature of their prophets as incarnations and spokesmen of the universal Christos, Isvara, or Dhyani Buddha, the latter itself being an aspect of the Unknown Root? The following words of Krishna, indicating his threefold nature, applied to the scriptures of other religions, should provide a pattern for understanding:

> Even though myself unborn, of changeless essence, and the lord of all existence, yet in presiding over nature—which is mine—I am born but through my own *maya,* the mystic power of self-ideation, the eternal thought in the eternal mind. I produce myself among creatures, O son of Bharata, whenever there is a decline of virtue and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world; and thus I incarnate from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of righteousness.

WORD PUZZLES

THE role of *logic* in theosophical study obviously needs investigation, since only religion dispensed by revelation can presume to do without the disciplines of ordered thought. The theosophical inquirer, whether living in the days of Ammonius or in the present, is obliged by his credo to search the field of religion scientifically—and the only laboratory tools available for this sort of work with intangibles are implements of thought. For each one to discover for himself an underlying core of psychological reality behind the verbal forms of religious doctrines, considerable analysis is required.

If not able to write an *Isis Unveiled,* one must at least be able to understand such a work, which means, finally, following threads of thought through the development given them by H. P. Blavatsky. All that she wrote was not part of a logical construct, of course, nor did she intend her books to be limited to this approach, but it is precisely her devotion to logic in respect to development of her fundamental propositions which encourages the reader to dwell without prejudice upon the *doctrines* she transmitted. "Speech is the logos of thought," she wrote in her *Glossary;* it is by study of inference, during the use of words, that the *manasic* power unfolds. While disciplined use of language will not of itself lead us to the "cause which is ever concealed," thus do we prepare the way for intuition to speak truly. In its original sense, *logic* means simply the science of using language correctly. Today we have a new division of analysis, called "semantics," and it is to be noted that here *Logic and Language*—to borrow the title of BBC speaker and professor, A. G. N. Flew—are receiving more attention in conjunction than "formal logic" has ever been able to attract. "*The spoken word has a potency unknown to* modern 'sages'," wrote H.P.B., and one form of that power is clearly the propensity of speech to directly affect the *manasic* constitution; reasonable use of language strengthens reason, and semantic accuracy may develop the discrimination. The Theosophist who knows something of semantic discipline, moreover, is more able to appreciate the paucity of English in regard to apt metaphysical terms—hence the reason for so many Sanskrit words in H.P.B.'s lexicon.

The *Encyclopædia Britannica* contains twenty-three pages of discourse upon *logic,* so important is this subject for all philosophical con-

sideration. The following extracts establish some of the distinctions often useful in the study of Theosophy:

> *Inference* is the act or process of deriving one judgment or proposition from another or from others. . . .
>
> Now logic is the study of *valid* inference, not *true* inference. This is not because logic is not interested in truth, for its own function is to explain the *true* conditions of valid inference. It is simply a case of that division of labour which necessity has forced upon all the sciences. The study of the conditions of *valid* inference means the study of the general relations between inferences and premises. This is a sufficiently important task by itself. The study of the conditions of *true* inference would mean, in addition, an investigation into the truth of all possible premises—an obviously impossible task. . . .
>
> Any violation of a rule of valid inference is called a fallacy. In calling a conclusion fallacious it is not meant that it is not true, but only that it is *not valid,* that is to say, that it is not justified by the evidence.

We do not, then, "prove" anything to be "true"—that is, factual—by use of logic, but we are able to demonstrate that certain inferences of propositions are consistent with the propositions. And so we build a philosophy; by use of that philosophy we are given guidance as to what inferences most merit our efforts to test through direct experience. *Logic* is a technique, operable only when some premise has been set forth, but unless one makes use of logic he has no way of knowing which "of all possible premises" offer the most consistent interpretations of experience. The Theosophist therefore may have faith in logic as one of *his* means of conducting independent investigation. If and when his capacity for logical thought reaches proficiency, moreover, he may then begin to share further in the thoughts of his teachers—which is something even more important than having "faith" in their teachings. No one can know a teacher truly through intuition alone; the teacher—not "revealer"—must use the method of inference in transmitting his teaching, and unless we can follow such developments of thought, *what* is said can never, in a strict "logical" sense, be regarded as more than revelation or hearsay.

To claim that any presentation of a great idea is thoroughly logical, is to claim that its form is perfect—a garment without any flaws or unevenness, so to speak. Few, however, know how to weave material of such excellence, and, even among those who sometimes can and do, the most creative ideas expressed by them will not always appear so

dressed. Thus overuse of the word *logic*—which implies knowledge of what constitutes perfection in a chain of reasoning—can be very misleading. A person may present an idea for consideration without claiming anything about that idea, save the right to express it. But to claim that a certain conclusion is "logical" at the very time of voicing, often becomes a club waved over the head of a listener; when someone is told, moreover, that a certain *doctrine* is "logical," this may amount to also telling him that if he does not accept it he is simply not a reasonable man. And the doctrine is actually neither logical nor illogical, *per se.* It is, instead, composed of elements which may or may not be logical inferences from certain premises, and of other elements, perhaps, which cannot be *fully* tested in this manner—affirmative, rather than "reasonable," in tone.

It is interesting to speculate upon what proportion of H. P. Blavatsky's writings present ideas in logical fashion. Certainly not those passages which outline theosophical doctrine, and there are many of them. Surely not her affirmations as to the existence of certain adept instructors who brought her into contact with those doctrines. The *idea* of adepts—or rather, beings who have reached a higher stage of ethical development than ourselves, since the *term* "adept" is neither logical nor illogical—is a natural extension of the Third Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine.* Given the premise of that proposition—and all *logic* must have some original premise to clothe—the idea of an infinitude of grades of intelligence follows inevitably. But it does not follow inevitably, we may see, that such beings are (*a*) called "adepts," (*b*) in close and direct communication with each other, (*c*) known to H.P.B., (*d*) her instructors. Whether *a, b, c,* and *d* are true, depends upon each individual finding out for himself; reason will not give him answers of this nature, so he must turn to direct experience—to which intuition may turn out to be the key.

It is true that acceptance of the fundamental premise of the Third Proposition of Theosophy, and a pondering of its logical implications, creates a mental atmosphere in which *a, b, c,* and *d* appear more credible than they could otherwise. Given that premise, H.P.B.'s statements about a fraternity of adepts and her own particular instructors are seen to be not *illogical.* Yet there is an all important distinction, so far as reasoning goes, between establishment of any conclusion or statement as "not illogical," and "being logical." In the first case the conclusion or statement has successfully passed a negative test: logic has nothing

ill to say of it. But logic cannot demonstrate a fact, it can only create lines of thought which tell us something about how to evaluate the facts we do encounter. It gives us, above all else, a testing laboratory similar to one functioning for the purpose of detecting false jewels. But in this case, the laboratory cannot proclaim any reported fact to be genuine—it can only report an absence of logical contradiction to the reported fact.

Logic shows us those principles and general ideas which are consistent with our premises. Logic does not, cannot, demonstrate particulars, for it deals with universals. Plato is our first Western logician, both in time and in honor, and he restricted himself to the statement of ethical principles and the extension of their implications through the processes of reasoning. Aristotle, on the other hand, tried to develop science on the basis of logical reasoning—and made an utter mess of things from a scientific point of view. His "facts" turned out to be no facts at all in the light of subsequent investigation, while Plato's reasoned extension of principles, upon which he and his readers can agree as premises, possesses the same validity to this day.

The identification of science with logic, so common in our time, is itself a cause of confusion. H.P.B. spoke to this point when she quoted from a volume of her day which criticized careless use of logic by certain physicists who seemed to think that the new men of science somehow gained the right to dictate new laws of thought (*S.D.* I, 485):

> Stallo's work, "Concepts of Modern Physics," a volume which has called forth the liveliest protests and criticisms, is recommended. . . . "The professed antagonism of Science to metaphysics," he writes, "has led the majority of scientific specialists to assume that the methods and results of empirical research are wholly independent of the control of the laws of thought. They either silently ignore, or openly repudiate, the simplest canons of logic, including the laws of non-contradiction and . . . resent with the utmost vehemence, every application of the rule of consistency to their hypotheses and theories . . . and they regard an examination (of these) . . . in the light of these laws as an impertinent intrusion of '*à priori* principles and methods' into the domains of empirical science. . . ."
>
> We see, whenever the Occultists are bold enough to raise their diminished heads, that materialistic, physical science is honeycombed with metaphysics; that its most fundamental principles, while inseparably wedded to transcendentalism, are nevertheless, in order to show modern science divorced from such "dreams," tortured and often ignored in the maze of contradictory theories and hypotheses.

Thus, one of H.P.B.'s fundamental criticisms of current scientific opinion was on logical grounds, and her appreciation of proper disciplines of inference is here made obvious. Elsewhere in the *S.D.* she more than once quotes from a text with which she was familiar—*Logic,* by Dr. Alexander Bain—which establishes points similar to those argued by Stallo in the previous quotation. In fact, all H.P.B.'s writings, including her many articles in *Lucifer* and *The Theosophist,* are honeycombed with criticism of conventional positions taken by both theologians and scientists—criticisms offered on logical grounds. That is, adopting for the moment, and for the sake of criticism, the very premises which the orthodox of either persuasion profess to hold, she then proceeds to demonstrate that neither religious nor scientific dogmas follow inevitably from these original assumptions—save in the case of such a "first premise" as original sin, which is not strictly a philosophical assumption at all.

For instance, the premise that the writings of the New Testament constitute proof that Christ was a "Son of God," does not make legitimate a claim that Jesus was a special creation—the *only* being to have enjoyed the paternity of deity. Similarly, the impressive psychological truths of the Bible need not lead devotees to deny the truths of *The Bhagavad-Gita,* the *Puranas,* the *Vedas,* the *Upanishads,* Pythagorean and Neo-Platonic writings, etc., for logic does not demand mutual exclusiveness. Nor, on the scientific side, did the discovery of certain laws of "natural selection" lead inescapably to the conclusion that the human soul derived its modifications and improvements for the interaction of geographical circumstances and physical adaptability. It is as if H.P.B., throughout, is making a running commentary upon the inevitable tendency of the human mind to stretch inferences beyond their legitimate scope. Extremes of bias, moreover, since they can be revealed by careful application of logical reasoning, may be gradually corrected by these means. The soundness of this approach is clearly demonstrated by the fact that the unwarranted conclusions of an older science and religion have been steadily modified by rational criticism, until the barriers between current views in both fields and those propounded by Madame Blavatsky have been eroded away in spectacular degree during the last hundred years.

But the role of logic in the presentation of Theosophy is by no means restricted to criticism or rebuttal of those who proclaim non-theo-

sophical opinions. Two illustrations will indicate the dynamic role that logic may play in expounding the theosophical purview: William Q. Judge begins one of his chapters in the *Ocean of Theosophy* with a statement to the effect that unless we deny the immortality of the soul, there is no rational justification for failure to consider the doctrine of reincarnation. For those who do accept the probability of immortality, whether on intuitive or any other grounds, the task but remains for logical inference to show that reincarnation is, as Hume put it, "the only doctrine [of immortality] to which philosophy can harken." John McTaggart, of Cambridge, a famous metaphysician and logician of the early 1900's, contributed an impressive demonstration of this fact in his book, *Human Immortality and Pre-existence.* Utilizing the canons of formal logic—too involved and specialized to be discussed with profit here—he led his readers, step by step, to the conclusion implied by William Q. Judge. Similarly, C. J. Ducasse, defending the idea of reincarnation before the American Philosophical Association in 1951, used the science of logical inference to give plausibility to the idea of rebirth of the human soul.

To take one other illustration: When H.P.B. wrote that "the whole quarrel between the esoteric and profane sciences lies in the demonstration of the existence of an astral body within the physical," the implicit suggestion is that once the proof of an electro-magnetic design body is accepted, logical reasoning will lead men of science to reconsider the idea of immortality. In the works of J. B. Rhine, referred to frequently during recent years in THEOSOPHY, something of this sort is constantly occurring. In this case, the existence of a set of "inner faculties," independent of the physical organism is in a measure equivalent to admitting the "astral."

Thus we have all grades and degrees of attention to "doctrines of the soul" among those who have interested themselves in the implications of extra-sensory perception. Raynor Johnson's *The Imprisoned Splendour* has carried this line of reasoning farther than any book to date, branching off into a frank and open evaluation of the relevance of theosophic terms and doctrines as applied to realms beyond the senses.

Finally, in conclusion, while it was obviously never H.P.B.'s intent to present the whole of her teachings as part of a tight logical system, her uses of *logic* can be seen to be both manifold and significant. A

student of H.P.B. is quite correct in concluding that many theosophic doctrines cannot be evaluated in logical terms—can only, in fact, be received with an attitude of sympathetic attentiveness caused by one's recognition of the qualifications of H.P.B. and Judge as teachers. But simply because there is *more* than logic in Theosophy, it need not be concluded that the science of logical inference is unimportant. Quite possibly we all give up efforts towards logical reasoning too soon, and thus miss uncovering subtle connecting links of thought, which might, in time, bring us to a more direct appreciation of the meaning of specific doctrinal teachings.

Images and Reflections

An image has two properties. First, it receives its being from the thing whose image it is, immediately and above will, for it is a natural product, sprouting out of its nature as a branch does out of a tree. Any face thrown on a mirror is, willy-nilly, imaged therein. But its nature does not appear in its looking-glass image: only the mouth, nose and eyes, just the features are seen in the glass.

Know, this impartible image of God which is stamped in the Soul is sealed direct in her innermost nature; this most fundamental, most noble part of her nature, is really what takes this soul-pattern, and that not by means either of will or wisdom.

The second characteristic of an image we note in its likeness to its object. And here observe especially two things. First: an image is not itself, neither is it its own. So an image received into the eye is not the eye itself nor has it any real existence in the eye but is merely suspended from and tethered to the thing it is the image of, whereto it entirely belongs and wherefrom it gets its being and is being that same being. Note well my definition of an image. There are four points to bear in mind, and haply others will occur to you. An image is not itself, neither is it its own; it is solely that thing's whose reflection it is and it is due to this alone that it exists at all. The image takes its being direct from the thing whose image it is, having one nature therewith and being the very same thing.

—Meister Eckhart

DOCTRINE OF SUBJECTIVE EXISTENCE

"... where Mara wields his strongest arms—
there lies a great reward *immediately* beyond."

WHEN we use the term *Buddhists,* we do not mean to imply by it either the exoteric Buddhism instituted by the followers of Gautama-Buddha, nor the modern Buddhistic religion, but the secret philosophy of Sakyamuni. This, in its essence, is a doctrine identical with the ancient wisdom-religion of the sanctuary, the pre-Vedic Brahmanism. By *Buddhism* is meant that religion signifying literally the doctrine of wisdom, and which by many ages antedates the metaphysical philosophy of Siddhârtha Sakyamuni. It is clear that the son of the King of Kapilavastu, and the descendant of the first Sakya (the family name) through his father—who was of the Kshatriya or warrior-caste—did not invent the philosophy. Philanthropist by nature, his ideas were developed and matured while under the tuition of Tir-thankara, the famous guru of the Jaïna sect. The latter claim the present Buddhism as a diverging branch of their own philosophy, and themselves, as the only followers of the first Buddha who were allowed to remain in India—after the expulsion by the Brahmans of all other Buddhists, probably because they had made a compromise, and admitted some of the Brahmanic notions.

The doctrine of God being the universal mind diffused through all things, underlies all ancient philosophies. The Buddhistic tenets, which can never be better comprehended than when studying the Pythagorean philosophy—its faithful reflection—are derived from this source, as well as the Brahmanical religion and early Christianity. It is by the spirit of the teachings of both Buddha and Pythagoras, that we can so easily recognize the identity of their doctrines. The all-pervading, universal soul, the *Anima Mundi,* is Nirvana; and Buddha, as a generic name, is the anthropomorphized *monad* of Pythagoras. When resting in Nirvana, the final bliss, Buddha is the silent monad, dwelling in darkness and silence. He is also the formless Brahm, the sublime but *unknowable* Deity which pervades invisibly the whole universe. Whenever it is manifested, desiring to impress itself upon humanity in a shape intelligible to our intellect, whether we call it an

---

NOTE.—Collated from *Isis Unveiled* and the *Theosophical Glossary.*

avatar, or a King Messiah, or a *permutation* of Divine Spirit, *Logos,* Christos, it is all one and the same thing. In each case it is "the Father," who is in the *Son,* and the Son in "the Father."

Many of our eminent antiquarians trace the Gnostic philosophies right back to Buddhism. We can assert with entire plausibility that of those sects immediately preceding the Christian era—Kabalism, Judaism, and our present Christianity included—not one but sprung from the two main branches of the one mother-trunk, the once universal religion which antedated the Vedic ages—we speak of that prehistoric Buddhism which merged later into Brahmanism. The religion which the primitive teaching of the early few apostles most resembled —a religion preached by Jesus himself—is the elder of these two, Buddhism. The latter as taught in its primitive purity, and carried to perfection by the last of the Buddhas, Gautama, based its moral ethics on three fundamental principles. It alleged: that everything existing, exists from natural causes; that virtue brings its own reward, and vice and sin their own punishment; and that the state of man in this world is probationary. We might add that on these three principles rested the universal foundation of every religious creed; God, and individual immortality for every man—if he could but win it. Buddha's esoteric teachings were the *Gupta Vidya* (secret knowledge) of the ancient Brahmans, the key to which their modern successors have, with few exceptions, lost. And this *Vidya* has passed into what is now known as the inner teachings of the *Mahayana* school of Northern Buddhism. The ethics of Theosophy and those taught by Buddha are identical. These ethics are the soul of the Wisdom Religion and were once the common property of the initiates of all nations. But Buddha was the first to embody these lofty ethics in his public teachings and to make them the foundation and the very essence of his *public* system. It is herein that lies the immense difference between Buddhism and every other religion. For while in other religions ritualism and dogma hold the first and most important place, in Buddhism it is the ethics which have always been the most insisted upon.

Gautama, no less than all other great reformers, had a doctrine for his "elect" and another for the outside masses, although the main object of his reform consisted in initiating all, so far as it was permissible and prudent to do—without distinction of caste or wealth—to the great truths hitherto kept so secret by the selfish Brahmanical class. It is not true, for instance, that Gautama never taught anything

concerning a future life, or that he denied the immortality of the soul. Ask any intelligent Buddhist his ideas on Nirvana, and he will unquestionably express himself as did the well-known Wong Chin-Fu, the Chinese orator, in a conversation about *Niepang* (Nirvana). "This condition," he remarked, "we all understand to mean a final reünion with God, coincident with the perfection of the human spirit by its ultimate disembarrassment of matter. Nirvana is the very opposite of personal annihilation." Gautama-Buddha it was whom we see the first in the world's history, moved by that generous feeling which locks the whole humanity within one embrace, inviting the "poor," the "lame," and the "blind" to the King's festival table, from which he excluded those who had hitherto sat alone, in haughty seclusion. It was he who, with a bold hand, first opened the door of the sanctuary to the pariah, the fallen one, and to all those "afflicted by men" clothed in gold and purple, often far less worthy than the outcast to whom their finger was scornfully pointing. All this did Siddhârtha six centuries before another reformer, as noble and as loving, though less favored by opportunity, in another land.

In the religion of Sakya-Muni, which learned commentators have delighted so much to set down as purely *nihilistic,* the doctrine of immortality is very clearly defined, notwithstanding the European or rather Christian ideas about Nirvana. In the sacred Jaïna books, of Patuna, the dying Gautama-Buddha is thus addressed: "Arise into *Nirvi* (Nirvana) from this decrepit body into which thou hast been sent. Ascend into *thy former abode,* O blessed Avatar!" This seems to us the very opposite of Nihilism. If Gautama is invited to reäscend into "his former abode," and this abode is Nirvana, then it is incontestable that Buddhistic philosophy does *not* teach final annihilation. As Jesus is alleged to have appeared to his disciples after death, so to the present day is Gautama believed to descend from Nirvana. And if he has an existence there, then this state cannot be a synonym for *annihilation.* It is not in the dead letter of Buddhistical sacred literature that scholars may hope to find the true solution of its metaphysical subtleties. The latter weary the power of thought by the inconceivable profundity of its ratiocination; and the student is never farther from the truth than when he believes himself nearest its discovery. The mastery of every doctrine of the perplexing Buddhist system can be attained only by proceeding strictly according to the Pythagorean and Platonic method; from universals down to particulars. The key to it lies in the refined

and mystical tenets of the spiritual influx of divine life. "Whoever is unacquainted with my law," says Buddha, "and dies in that state, must return to the earth till he becomes a perfect Samanean (or Bodhisattva). To achieve this object, he must destroy within himself the trinity of *Maya* (matter in its triple manifestation). He must extinguish his passions, unite and identify himself with *the law* (the teaching of the secret doctrine), and comprehend the religion of *annihilation.*"

Here, annihilation refers but to *matter,* that of the visible as well as of the invisible body; for the astral soul (*perisprit*) is still matter, however sublimated. The same book says that what Fo (Buddha) meant to say was, that "the primitive substance is eternal and unchangeable." Its highest revelation is the pure, luminous ether, the boundless infinite space, not a void resulting from the absence of forms, but on the contrary *the foundation of all forms,* and anterior to them. "But the very presence of *forms* denotes it to be the creation of *Maya,* and all her works are as nothing before the *uncreated* being, SPIRIT, in whose profound and sacred repose all motion must cease forever." Thus *annihilation* means, with the Buddhistical philosophy, only a dispersion of matter, in whatever form or *semblance* of form it may be; for everything that bears a shape was created, and thus must sooner or later perish, *i.e.,* change that shape. Therefore, as something temporary, though seeming to be permanent, it is but an illusion, *Maya;* for, as eternity has neither beginning nor end, the more or less prolonged duration of some particular form passes, as it were, like an instantaneous flash of lightning. Before we have time to realize that we have seen it, it is gone and passed away for ever. Hence, even our astral bodies, pure ether, are but illusions of matter, so long as they retain their terrestrial outline. The latter changes, says the Buddhist, according to the merits or demerits of the person during his lifetime, and this is metempsychosis. The purifying process of transmigrations—the metempsychoses—however grossly anthropomorphized at a later period, must only be regarded as a supplementary doctrine, disfigured by theological sophistry with the object of getting a firmer hold upon believers through a popular superstition. Neither Gautama Buddha nor Pythagoras intended to teach this purely metaphysical allegory *literally.* Esoterically, it relates to the purely spiritual peregrinations of the human soul.

In the Buddhist texts the negative is treated as essential *existence.*

Annihilation comes under a similar exegesis. The positive state is essential *being* but no manifestation as such. When the spirit, in Buddhistic parlance, entered Nirvana, it lost objective existence but retained subjective. To objective minds this is becoming absolute nothing, to subjective, nothing to be displayed to sense. Nirvana means the certitude of personal immortality in *Spirit,* not in *Soul,* which, as a finite emanation, must certainly disintegrate its particles which are a compound of human sensations, passions, and yearning for some objective kind of existence, before the immortal spirit of the *Ego* is quite freed and henceforth secure against further transmigration in any form. And how can man ever reach this state so long as the *Upadana,* that state of longing for *life,* more life, does not disappear from the sentient being, from the *Ahankara* clothed, however, in a sublimated body? It is the "Upadana" or the intense desire which produces WILL, and it is *will* which develops *force,* or an object having form. Thus the Ego, through this sole undying desire in him, unconsciously furnishes the conditions of his successive self-procreations in various forms, which depend on his mental state and Karma, the good and bad deeds of his preceding existence, commonly called "merit and demerit."

"What is that which has no body, no *form;* which is imponderable, invisible and indivisible; that which exists and yet *is not?*" ask the Buddhists. "It is Nirvana," is the answer. It is NOTHING, not a region, but rather a state. When once Nirvana is reached man is exempt from the effects of the "four truths"; for an effect can only be produced through a certain cause, and every cause is annihilated in this state. These "four truths" are the foundation of the whole Buddhistic doctrine of Nirvana. They are, says the book "Perfection of Wisdom" (*Pradjna Paramita*): the existence of pain; the production of pain; the annihilation of pain; and the way to the annihilation of pain. What is the source of pain? It is existence. Birth existing, decrepitude and death ensue, for wherever there is a form there is *cause* for pain and suffering. *Spirit* alone has no form and therefore *cannot be said to exist.* Whenever man (the ethereal, inner man) reaches that point when he becomes utterly spiritual, hence formless, he has reached that state of perfect bliss. MAN as an objective being becomes annihilated, but the spiritual entity with its subjective life will live forever, for spirit is incorruptible and immortal.

We ought to understand, with the Buddhist metaphysicians, that though the individual human spirits are numberless, collectively they

are one, as every drop of water drawn out of the ocean, metaphorically speaking, may have an individual existence and still be one with the rest of the drops going to form the ocean. For each human spirit is a scintilla of the one all-pervading Light. This divine spirit animates the flower, the particle of granite on the mountainside, the lion, the man. The immortal spirit overshadows the mortal man. It enters into him, and pervading his whole being, makes of him a god, who descends into his earthly tabernacle. Every man may become a Buddha, says the doctrine. And so throughout the interminable series of ages we find now and then men who more or less succeed in *uniting* themselves "with God," as the expression goes—with their *own spirit,* as we ought to translate. This is why the "Master" recommended to his mendicants the cultivation of the four degrees of Dhyana, the noble "Path of the Four Truths," or the gradual acquirement of stoical indifference for either life or death. This is the state of spiritual self-contemplation during which man utterly loses sight of his physical and dual personality, composed of soul and body; he unites himself with his third and higher immortal self, the *real heavenly man* merging so to say into the divine Essence, whence his own spirit proceeded like a spark from the common hearth. The Buddhists call such a man Arhat. An Arhat is next to a Buddha, and none is equal to him in *infused* science, or miraculous powers. Thus the Arhat, the holy mendicant, can reach Nirvana while yet on earth; and his spirit, totally freed from the trammels of the "psychical, terrestrial, *devilish* wisdom," as James calls it, and being in its own nature omniscient and omnipotent, can on earth, through the sole power of his *thought* produce the greatest of phenomena.

The Buddhas are not gods, but simply individuals overshadowed by the spirit of Buddha—the divine ray. Buddha means literally "the Enlightened," the highest degree of knowledge. Esoteric teachings claim that Gautama Buddha renounced Nirvana and gave up the Dharmakaya vesture to remain a "Buddha of compassion" within the reach of the miseries of the world. And the religious philosophy he left to it has produced for over 2,000 years generations of good and unselfish men. His is the only *absolutely bloodless* religion among all the existing religions: tolerant and liberal, teaching universal compassion and charity, love and self-sacrifice, poverty and contentment with one's lot, whatever it may be. No persecutions, and enforcements of faith by fire and sword, have ever disgraced it. No thunder-and-light-

ning-vomiting god has interfered with its chaste commandments; and if the simple, humane and philosophical code of daily life left to us by the greatest Man-Reformer ever known, should ever come to be adopted by mankind at large, then indeed an era of bliss and peace would dawn on Humanity. But dreary and sad were the ways, and blood-covered the tortuous paths by which the world of the Christians was driven to embrace the Irenæan and Eusebian Christianity. And yet, unless we accept the views of the ancient Pagans, what claim has our generation to having solved any of the mysteries of the "kingdom of heaven," *i.e.,* Nirvana? What more does the most pious and learned of Christians know of the future destiny and progress of our immortal spirits than the heathen philosopher of old, or the modern "Pagan" beyond the Himalaya? Can he even boast that he knows as much, although he works in the full blaze of "divine" revelation?

Christianity becomes every day more a religion of pure emotionalism. The doctrine of Buddha is entirely based on practical works. A general love of all beings, human and animal, is its nucleus. A man who knows that unless he toils for himself he has to starve, and understands that he has no scapegoat to carry the burden of his iniquities for him, is ten times as likely to become a better man than one who is taught that murder, theft, and profligacy can be washed in one instant as white as snow, if he but believes in a God who, to borrow an expression from Volney, "once took food upon earth, and is now himself the food of his people." We have seen a Buddhist holding to the religion of his fathers, both in theory and practice; and however blind may be his faith, however absurd his notions on some particular doctrinal points —later engraftings of an ambitious clergy—yet in practical works his Buddhism is far more Christ-like in deed and spirit than the average life of our Christian priests and ministers. The fact alone that his religion commands him to "honor his own faith, but never slander that of other people," is sufficient. It places the Buddhist lama immeasurably higher than any priest or clergyman who deems it his sacred duty to curse the "heathen" to his face, and sentence him and his religion to "eternal damnation."

Every Orientalist and Pundit knows by heart the story of Gautama, the most perfect of mortal men that the world has ever seen, but none of them seem to suspect the esoteric meaning underlying his *prenatal* biography, *i.e.,* the significance of the popular story. The *Lalitavistâra* tells the tale, but abstains from hinting at the truth. The 5,000 *Jâtakas,*

or the events of former births (re-incarnations) are taken literally instead of esoterically. Gautama, the Buddha, would not have been a mortal man, had he not passed through hundreds and thousands of births previous to his last. The hidden symbolism in the sequence of these re-births contains a perfect history of the evolution on this earth, *pre* and *post* human, and is a scientific exposition of natural facts. One truth not veiled but bare and open is found in the nomenclature of the *Jâtakas:* As soon as Gautama had reached the human form he began exhibiting in every personality the utmost unselfishness, self-sacrifice and charity. "Buddha Gautama, the fourth of the Sapta (Seven) Buddhas and Sapta Tathâgatas, was born according to the Singhalese chronicles, in the year 621 before our era. He fled from his father's palace to become an ascetic on the night of the 8th day of the second moon, 597 B.C., and having passed six years in ascetic meditation at Gaya, and perceiving that physical self-torture was useless to bring enlightenment, he decided upon striking out on a new path, until he reached the state of Bodhi. He became a full Buddha on the night of the 8th day of the twelfth moon, in the year 592, and finally entered Nirvâna in the year 543, according to Southern Buddhism. . . . All the rest of the events are allegorical." But it is recorded also: "Samyak Sambuddha, the Teacher of Perfection, gave up his SELF for the salvation of the World, by stopping at the threshold of Nirvana—the pure state."

It is well ascertained that Buddhist Arhats began their religious exodus for the purpose of propagating the new faith beyond Kashmir and the Himalayas, as early as the year 300 before our era, and reached China in the year 61 A.D. when "Kashyapa at the invitation of the Emperor Ming-ti went there to acquaint the 'Son of Heaven' with the tenets of Buddhism." Buddhist missionaries made their way to the Mesopotamian Valley, and even went so far west as Ireland. The Arhats began by following the policy of their Master. But the majority of the *subsequent* priests were not initiated, just as in Christianity. So, little by little the great esoteric truths became almost lost. These truths were the same secret doctrines of the Magi, of the pre-Vedic Buddhists, of the hierophants of the Egyptian Thoth or Hermes, and of the adepts of whatever age and nationality including the Chaldean kabalists and the Jewish *nazars.* They were identical from the beginning; Gautama-Buddha's philosophy was that taught *from the beginning of time* in the impenetrable secrecy of the inner sanctuaries of the pagodas.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

IS there any virtue in pride?

(*a*) It has been said that pride is the highest aspect of the lower nature. It is what Krishna appealed to in Arjuna when the latter was despondent. Krishna used Arjuna's pride because he saw that Arjuna was then so wrapped up in his lower nature that there was no readiness to respond directly to the highest aspirations. Pride would seem to be that which the personal man holds very dear, and which is very hard to give up. It has to do with what the man thinks he is, for if we say something hurts our pride, we feel we are hurt to the core. It must be due to the false attachment to the personality.

It is said that pride is the last stronghold of the personal man, for one who has climbed the ladder almost to perfection may fall, due to pride in his achievement. In the sense used in the preceding illustration, it doesn't seem that pride can have much value, but in the case of Arjuna it was a step to a broadening of his outlook in life.

We use the word "pride" in several ways. We sometimes are admonished to take "pride" in our work. There would certainly seem to be virtue in the pride just mentioned. It is almost like the central paradox presented in the *Gita* that we seem to have so much trouble understanding: Should we be interested in the fruits of our actions or not? At one time Krishna seems to indicate that we mustn't be concerned, and on another occasion he admonishes Arjuna to be concerned. The key to this paradox, as so often pointed out, is that we need to be very concerned indeed with what result our actions will have on others. We must carefully weigh the possible result before we act. But once having considered the action's possible result, and acted, we must leave the rest in the hands of the Law, completely unconcerned as to the results that may accrue to ourselves. So with pride. We must take "pride" in our work. We must consider that we do the very best job possible, but once the job is done to the best of our ability, we must put any thoughts of pride in the accomplishment completely out of our minds. This is the only real virtue in pride: that we look to see that the things we do are the best, so that everyone concerned may find happiness in our act; from there on, the result should not preoccupy our imagination.

(*b*) We are reminded of H. P. Blavatsky's expression of "pride" in being a citizen of the United States. Hers was an appreciation of

all that is dedicated to the good of humanity. She urged the early members of the Theosophical Society to be impersonal forces for good, careless of praise or blame so long as the purposes of Brotherhood were served. How many in the world today are willing to sacrifice themselves thus? This kind of position demands an attitude that transcends *all* purely personal pride.

Considering both individual and collective problems, it becomes apparent that pride is one of the principal obstructions to their solution. What is it that makes one person refuse to give an apology after an argument? Or accept help when it is sincerely offered?

The psychiatric analysis of pride and its causes is found in the classification and treatment of superiority and inferiority complexes. As *words,* both terms belong to the average person's vocabulary, although twenty-five years ago none but a few students of psychology knew them.

One symptom of mental breakdown is the withdrawal of the person himself. The permanent cure, it appears, is to teach the person to accept his difficulties, to suffer the wounds to his pride, his lower nature, and to turn *without* to help those worse off than himself.

(*c*) We see from the foregoing paragraphs that there are different aspects and uses of pride, Krishna using the spur of pride constructively in urging Arjuna to "stand up and fight," or, in other words, to be, as he can be, a courageous man.

The expression "pride," in present-day usage, has acquired several shades of meaning. For example, Merriam-Webster's *Pocket Dictionary* states: "1) Conceit, 2) Justifiable self-respect. . .," whereas the *New Collegiate Dictionary* gives: "Lofty self-respect; a *reasonable* delight in one's position, achievements, possessions, etc." Walt Whitman adds a transcendental dimension in *Leaves of Grass:*

> The full-spread pride of man is calming and excellent
> to the soul,
> Knowledge becomes him, he likes it always, he brings everything
> to the test of himself. . . .

For the sake of clarity, pride might be thought of under two headings: (1) static preoccupation with personal accomplishments; (2) justifiable self-respect, *i.e.,* confidence based on objective self-evaluation. From a psychiatric standpoint, conceit, as a substitute for real self-confidence—often the outcome of inferiority feelings—might be thought of as the counterfeit of a sort of pride. If a "reasonable delight" in one's capacities as a human being, though, be the position

of Walt Whitman, pride of this sort is not a question of "virtue," but rather a matter of knowledge concerning one's potentialities.

Is it good to give praise?

Praise, of itself, is not to be considered in a disparaging sense, although it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between commendation and flattery, and it would be well to note the effects upon people of undue adulation. Praise is often bestowed because of work well done. So used, it can be a boon, provided it be given as sincere encouragement and taken as a stimulus to further effort. For example, H. P. Blavatsky, in her last "Message" to the American Theosophists in 1891, extended official approbation to her colleague, Mr. William Q. Judge, and bestowed honor "where honor is due."

It is held in Theosophy that it is better to err on the side of praise than to give too little recognition, but care must be taken to restrain the personal element. In *The Friendly Philosopher,* Mr. Crosbie shows how the personality is the most difficult thing to overcome in our culture, where nearly all training accentuates it: "Adulation fosters ambition, if the least thought of self remains." In the midst of whatever circumstances the student encounters, whether of praise or blame, he would do well to remember: "that power which the disciple shall covet, is that which shall make him appear as nothing in the eyes of men."

Why doesn't U.L.T. sponsor social activities as churches do?

We know that the work of the Lodge leaves little time for any form of activity that is not in direct line with its goal and purpose. Does this mean, then, that social activities are to be eschewed? Not by any means. It seems that we would do well to consider the relationship between mutual philosophic study and social life.

There are two ways of doing things. So far as true happiness is concerned, the utilitarian approach may be considered as one method: that is, that a satisfied appetite, whether physical or emotional, produces harmony. The other attitude is that of a community of ideas and ideals that govern our attitude toward any circumstance or event.

Children of Theosophy School are helped to determine for themselves in what a true social ideal consists. They gain a foundation which helps them resist the disorganizing social activities and customs of the day. The *Teacher's Manual* used in Theosophy School is an invaluable aid in the study of a real society.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Vegetarianism Today

H. P. Blavatsky once affirmed, when asked about the beliefs of vegetarians in her time, that "many of the things they say are quite true," a statement we have no reason to believe is less valid today than in 1890. And there is a considerable amount of evidence to suggest that the "abstainers from flesh" have *gained,* rather than lost, in philosophic balance, since the *Key to Theosophy* was written. For one thing, leading vegetarian publications display less of a sectarian spirit, make friendlier statement of their case. In England, particularly, the activities of the London Vegetarian Society, and an expression of characteristic opinions through its official organ, *Vegetarian News,* are promising in this regard.

Quoting from an issue selected at random, we cannot fail to note some distinctly theosophical overtones in the opening editorial. The writer there advances the belief that the real importance of disciplined adherence to a vegetarian diet lies in the increased respect it encourages for the sanctity of *all living beings*—that vegetarianism is thus but a means to an end, and that end the realization of universal brotherhood. Each man, it is asserted, must work on the refinement and purification of his own physical and emotional "instruments," if there is to be a lessening of international fratricide. The vegetarian, it is affirmed, takes the view that the lower emotions *can be successfully controlled;* he holds the philosophy that "the real nature of Man is a spiritual being possessing a physical body—and not vice-versa." "Unless this hypothesis is appreciated," the editor continues, "the real oneness of life cannot be perceived and the true significance of all the parts in relation to the whole cannot be seen in their true value, and perspective—as links in a vital chain the strength of which will be equivalent to that of its weakest link."

A Time Honored Practice

The editorial—which is anonymous—continues with a development of the implications of this basic view:

> The most vital aspect in regard to flesh-eating, as it affects man specifically, lies, undoubtedly, in its relation to the balance of function-

ing and the interplay of material and spiritual forces; and it is just at this point, and in this relationship, that diet becomes a vital issue in connection with both human health (for lack of which vivisection draws its strongest claims to justification) and war, the latter because it is not material force which will ultimately bring peace, but spiritual power intelligently directed through highly perceptive, selfless minds, against evil mental states—false ideas, ideals and standards and the thinking which goes with these—which condition men's actions.

It has been known in the East for ages and taught in the most enlightened schools of Yoga that infinite power is available to the individual who is prepared to obey the moral law of harmlessness to all living beings in his own life and actions, and that the *consciousness* of power comes gradually as one's various bodies, including the physical, are conditioned to receive and endure it. An essential condition, apart from mental and emotional balance and integrity, has always been the use of a simple and natural diet of highly solarised foods and the total elimination of all dead and decaying foods, such as flesh, from the diet. Meditation and other similar practices can result in damage to health and mental stability without this safeguard.

A Corollary from H. P. Blavatsky

In *The Key to Theosophy* (p. 260), H.P.B. avers that some definite ascetic practices—to be determined upon the judgment of each individual for himself, are natural and expected accompaniments of the deeper practices of occultism. To illustrate that considerable scientific foundation exists for the belief that an excess of animal foods may be in many ways deleterious, she writes:

One of the great German scientists has shown that every kind of animal tissue, however you may cook it, still retains certain marked characteristics of the animal which it belonged to, which characteristics can be recognized. And apart from that, every one knows by the taste what meat he is eating. We go a step farther, and prove that when the flesh of animals is assimilated by man as food, it imparts to him, physiologically, some of the characteristics of the animal it came from. Moreover, occult science teaches and proves this to its students by ocular demonstration, showing also that this "coarsening" or "animalizing" effect on man is greatest from the flesh of the larger animals, less for birds, still less for fish and other cold-blooded animals, and least of all when he eats only vegetables. . . . we believe that much disease, and especially the great predisposition to disease which is becoming so marked a feature in our time, is very largely due to the eating of meat, and especially of tinned meats. But it would take too long to go thoroughly into this question of vegetarianism on its merits.

Qualifications from Both Sources

In the same section of the *Key,* however, H.P.B. also suggests that it would be a mistake for a Theosophist to feel he was making spiritual progress simply because he gave up a flesh diet. As William Q. Judge and Robert Crosbie pointed out in later years, most of us, being possessed of "bodies of the race," cannot always select the theoretically ideal diet without regard for karmic circumstance. Thus, an attempt by any theosophical body of students to adopt vegetarianism en masse might easily lead to the detriment of health for some, nor is the successful practice of vegetarianism by those for whom it is congenial any guarantee of "enlightenment of the higher faculties"—if the motivations behind such a decision involve pride in piety.

The editorial writer for *Vegetarian News* recognizes this, summing up the matter in this way:

> But do not let us be deluded; no mere change in dietary habits will achieve the miracle; this primarily affects the temporary house of flesh which the spiritual man inhabits. The man himself must think nobly, aspire loftily and serve humbly, according to his highest vision and he will be enabled to do this the more effectively if he possesses a brain which registers and transmits his nobler ideas accurately and a body which responds sensitively to the higher spiritual influences; and a pure diet, free from blood, is a positive contribution towards that end.

Glimpse of The Third Proposition of Theosophy

The article concludes by stressing the non-sectarian position taken by the Vegetarian Society—after adducing evidence to show a basis in demonstrable scientific fact for the claim that various intangible benefits accrue when flesh eating is terminated. He writes:

> (The recent experiment with delinquent children in a Salvation Army Home has gone far to prove that diet affects the moral character.) In particular we believe there is considerable evidence to show that flesh foods, more than any others, tend to minimize and retard the spiritualizing process of the material elements of the physical body and to shut down, as it were, the consciousness of humanity at the material level.
>
> It is not within our province to put forward or to advocate any specific system of philosophy or religious belief but rather to advocate to all the adoption of that diet which is known, and has been known to many throughout the ages, to be in harmony with man's spiritual constitution which contributes positively towards the fulfilment of the

> real purpose of existence, namely, to the realisation, by man, of his spiritual nature while still possessing, and using to the full, a physical body and human faculties.

ALL ARE NOT FANATICS

There are doubtless faddists among the writers and subscribers of this publication, but we also find others of distinguished reputation—authors and political servants of note—who feel that some extremely important issues are bound up in reasons which favor vegetarianism practice. (Roy Walker, for instance, a capable Shakespeare scholar whose books reveal clear theosophical overtones, served for some time as chief editor of *Vegetarian News;* Lord Boyd-Orr, expert on nutrition, lent the weight of his findings to the claim that the growing population of the earth cannot be sustained successfully in any other way than by transition to vegetarianism.) The autumn issue of *VN,* quoted above, contains a summary of remarks relating to vegetarian practices by BBC commentators and other semi-official spokesmen of England, substantiating, from a scientific point of view, many of the claims long put forward by the Vegetarian Society. Also to be noted throughout the publication is the continual representation of that basic theosophical view as to the nature of man thus expressed by the editor: "a spiritual being possessing a physical body and not vice versa."

"THE MAGICIANS"

This latest novel by J. B. Priestley merits special notice from Theosophists, for here the famous and prolific English author and playwright produces persuasive argument for consideration of Karma and Reincarnation. These terms are never mentioned, but the point of view which they suggest is integral to the structure of a fascinating plot.

Mr. Priestley has made similar efforts in the past, and found critics and reviewers still prejudiced against direct assault upon the citadels of orthodox opinion. But the three "Magicians" who are the real heroes of his new book are so disarming in their revelation of the Karma-Reincarnation view that a better reception may be expected.

The following passages provide adequate illustration of how Mr. Priestley achieves his effect, in this case recounting how the central character, one Sir Charles Ravenstreet, is aided by three wise men to see his existence in an entirely new light:

The Timeless Vision

> It was then that the revisiting elderly Ravenstreet, like a man long in the desert feeling the rain on his outstretched hands, knew again an experience he had long forgotten, one that all children and probably most women know but that men forget, a sense and feeling compounded of cosy security, gratitude, and wonder, just because nearly everybody they want to be there *is* there, all enormously and magically themselves and securely set in the same atmosphere; a sense and a feeling into which there enters an obscure conviction of immortality; as if somewhere at the root of it there might be knowledge, buried deep in the heart, that nobody blessed by this atmosphere of well-being and affection, lit with such wonder and delight, could possibly go away for ever, die and turn to dust, be lost in the dark spaces of the universe; as if there stirred in our homeless minds some faint memory of the fields of paradise. And Ravenstreet, recapturing this experience just as he tasted again the morning's long-lost sights and smells, wondered if he might be merely recovering one of childhood's illusions or returning to a wisdom mislaid in the scramble of passing time, becoming aware of a profounder insight into the nature of our life and being.

Involvement of Sun with Earth

The San Francisco *Examiner,* Oct. 13, reports that "a four-year study of the relationship between the intensity of the rays and temperature, rainfall and upper winds in the central part of the United States was recently completed by E. D. Farthing, assistant meteorologist for the Trans-World Airlines"; and *Newsweek* for Oct. 25 comments on the same report:

> Farthing gets his celestial weather tip-offs from changes in the shape and composition of the sun's vast, hot halo of outer atmosphere —the corona. . . .
>
> The sweeping dance of the corona, particularly its emanations of green and red rays, is watched at the High Altitude Observatory, Climax, Colo. . . . The astronomers, of course, can only get their corona readings in profile. Thus they pick up areas of green or red activity above the sun's east rim. Seven days later, by virtue of the sun's rotation period of about 28 days, that particular activity will be aimed in the general direction of the earth.

Statistics Produced

Newsweek gives the "gist" of the statistics:

> (1) A high level of green emanation warns of heavy rainfall (in Kansas City, at least). More red emission than green spells drought. The most violent green activity in more than two years, began early

this month a few days prior to heavy Midwest rains that have flooded Chicago. (2) Low green activity facing the earth seems to slow or even stop certain cold fronts about to engulf Kansas City. (3) Intense green activity appears to shorten, by an average of nearly fifteen minutes, the flight time of nonstop eastbound transcontinental planes.

The precise connection between the coronal indicators and Kansas City weather remains almost a total mystery to both the astronomers and meteorologists. About all they will hazard is that the green and red signals may be produced by the same something that shoots a beam of radiation, probably in the x-ray or ultraviolet range, to shower the earth from time to time.

THE INTERACTING "SOMETHING"

The following, culled from a letter attributed to one of the theosophical adepts by Mr. A. P. Sinnett, suggests that this "same something" may be magnetism. A few rather puzzling extracts are given as a basis for individual speculation—somewhat in contradiction to the statistical finding just discussed:

All the phenomena of earth currents, terrestrial magnetism and atmospheric electricity, are due to the fact that the earth is an electrified conductor. . . . Even simple muscular contraction is always accompanied with electric and magnetic phenomena, and there is the strongest connection between the magnetism of the earth, the changes of weather and *man,* who is the best barometer living, if he but knew to decipher it properly. . . . With us, it is an established fact that it is the earth's magnetism that produces wind, storms, and rain. . . . I do not know of any "set of motions established by pressures, expansions, etc., *due in the first instance to solar energy.*" Science makes too much and too little at the same time of "solar energy" and even of the sun itself; and the sun has nothing to do whatever with rain and very little with heat. . . .

[The corona] is simply the magnetic and ever present order of the sun. . . . A counterpart of what the astronomers call the red flames in the "corona" may be seen in Reichenbach's crystals or in any other strongly magnetic body. The head of a man—in a strong ecstatic condition, when all the electricity of his system is centred around the brain, will represent—expecially in darkness—a perfect simile of the Sun during such periods. . . . The closer to the head or to the aura-emitting body—the stronger and the more effulgent the emanation . . . ; hence—the irregular red flames around the Sun or the inner corona. The fact that those are not always present in equal quantity shows only the constant fluctuation of the magnetic matter and its energy, upon which also depends the variety and number of spots. . . .

> The coronal changes have no effect on the earth's climate, though *spots* have. . . . The sun is neither a *solid* nor a *liquid,* nor yet a gaseous glow; but a gigantic ball of electromagnetic Forces, the storehouse of universal *life* and *motion*. . . .

The Karma of Slavery

An interesting passage from an otherwise not to be recommended book by Douglas Reed, *Somewhere South of Suez,* furnishes a clear illustration of inexorable law in societal affairs. Mr. Reed concerns himself with the problem of the "poor white," both in South Africa and the United States, recognizing that those who belong to this class are likely to become both transmitters of cultural degradation and a source of continual tension between the two races at the lower income levels. Mr. Reed writes:

> If the "poor white" is in fact a separate species and problem, then clearly he appears where white men and black ones meet, and especially where the black men were once slaves. Is this the vengeance of slavery? Two hundred years ago one of the Dutch Governors of the East Indies, Van Imoff, when he visited The Cape, said: "I believe it would have been far better had we, when this Colony was founded, commenced with Europeans and brought them hither in such numbers, that hunger and want would have forced them to work. But having imported slaves, every common or ordinary European becomes a gentleman and prefers to be served rather than to serve. We have in addition the fact that the majority of the farmers in the Colony are not farmers in the real sense of the word, but owners of plantations, and that many of them consider it a shame to work with their own hands."

"The Quality of Tamas"

Men who become slothful through shirking of responsibility apparently acquire attitudes of "indifference and darkness"—the quality of *Tamas*—in respect to other aspects of their lives. Thus, even when the formal condition of slavery is abolished, the psychological and sociological results remain to plague future generations. If all Karma has its focus in the psychic nature of man, and since habitude of the psyche can be at best altered only during passage of centuries, the handicap is certainly a great one.

Mr. Reed concludes his discussion with the following summary:

> The words of enlightened men ring sadly down the centuries; during the War between the States in America many southerners felt

> as Van Imoff felt a hundred years earlier. The penalty of restricting the white population and using slave-labour, in countries claimed for the white man, was the deterioration of a substantial mass of the white population to the level of the dark man, or lower. The same factors, in South Africa, hinder the process of regeneration today; slavery has gone, but the poor white still expects his household chores to be done by Natives.

EVOLUTION OF A HYPNOTIST

The Sunday supplement of the Denver *Post* recently featured a two-part article, "The Strange Search for Bridey Murphy," by Wm. Barker. This is an account of an attempt to extract verifiable evidence of reincarnation by means of "regression" during hypnosis.

Morey Bernstein, the hypnotist, is a business executive living in Pueblo, Colo., who became interested in hypnotism through a desire to expose its fraudulence—as *he* assumed. When, however, Bernstein found himself not only able to hypnotize his wife, but also to cure her migraine headaches by post-hypnotic suggestion, he became deeply interested in hypnotism and studied assiduously everything he could find on the subject. Eventually, Bernstein became recognized as an "expert" whose services were frequently requested by physicians and psychologists. Throughout, however, Mr. Bernstein has preserved his amateur status—a point always of interest to Theosophists when any psychic power is used directly.

BERNSTEIN AND ESP

Mr. Bernstein became temporarily interested in ESP when, during a session with a psychologist and his patient, the patient, now hypnotized, gave a spontaneous demonstration of clairvoyance. After reading *Frontiers of the Mind* and *Reach of the Mind* by Dr. J. B. Rhine, Mr. Bernstein corresponded directly with Dr. Rhine, finally setting up a series of tests under Dr. Rhine's direction, and employing two hypnotized subjects. Of these tests, Mr. Bernstein reports:

> The number of correct answers was statistically significant. But 350 tests were not sufficient to offer as scientific evidence. Furthermore, there were faults in our testing methods which confused the issue. To a surprising degree, for instance, the guy receiving the image would name *not* the gadget the sender was holding and thinking about, but the *next* gadget the sender was *going to be handed*. . . . If that sort of thing could have been scored, the record for accuracy would have been fantastically high.

Is there a suggestion here, perhaps, that under certain conditions *pre*-cognition is easier than cognition? A strange and interesting corollary to views developed in Erich Fromm's *Forgotten Language,* in any case.

True to Form

Mr. Bernstein's interest in reincarnation followed much the same pattern as had his original interest in hypnotism. According to the article:

> About this time one of Bernstein's business associates heard Morey was interested in psychic phenomena and hypnotism and sent him some books to read.
>
> One book, *Many Mansions,* by Gina Cerminara, irritated Bernstein so much at the outset that he heaved it into a corner and refused to finish it.
>
> "Hypnotism and telepathy, those things are factual," he told his wife Hazel. "But when they try to drag reincarnation into it, that's going too far."

Later, Bernstein not only retrieved the book from the corner and read it, but also read *There Is a River,* by Thomas Sugrue. Both these books "tell the fantastic story" of Edgar Cayce (see THEOSOPHY 40: 101). This story so captivated Mr. Bernstein's fancy that he took advantage of a business trip to stop at Virginia Beach, Va., "demanding a look at the Cayce files which are there. . ." After reading the files and interviewing "some forty-odd patients of Edgar Cayce"—

> Morey came home with his mind made up about one thing. He himself was a hypnotist, capable of putting a willing subject through an age regression which would cause the subject to recall what he or she had done at any time in early childhood.
>
> All right, then. Morey would take a subject who was capable of a very deep trance and he'd see if that subject remembered what had happened in a previous lifetime—if such a thing were at all possible.

Glimpses of a Previous Life

Almost by chance a perfect subject was found and the experiments were begun. Gradually, under Bernstein's careful direction, a new personality emerged—a tape-recording preserving each session in its entirety. Selecting and paraphrasing from the article, we find:

> "Bridey Murphy" *first* as a child of four, crying because she "got an awful spankin' " for scratching the paint off her bed in a fit of anger;

then as an eight-year-old, playing house with her brother Duncan who was named after their father. Bridey recalled, with some difficulty, that this was in 1806. She mentioned another brother who died as a baby. Her father, said Bridey, was a barrister—pronouncing it *bahrstur*—the first clue that Bernstein might really have something in his experiment. According to Bridey, her hair was "real red." (The subject, "Mrs. S.," was a brunette.)

FILLING IN THE PICTURE

Further:

The recorder turned silently and the tape gradually filled with fragmentary statements about a forgotten family which had lived, it seemed, in the first half of the 19th century. The three listeners, Bernstein, his wife, and the subject's husband heard Bridey Murphy at 15, telling how she attended Mrs. Strayne's school in Cork "studying to be a lady," learning "house things and proper things." They visualized her as she married Brian MacCarthy, a young barrister who took her to the large northern city of Belfast to live "in a cottage back of his grandmother's house," not far from "St. Theresa's church."

As the narrative ran on, a subtle brogue crept into Bridey's voice —so subtle that presumably only an accomplished actress could have faked it and maintained it.

SPECULATION ON BRIEF INTERLUDE

Although Theosophists are aware of the fact that 1500 years is but the *average* devachanic interlude for the entire mass of reincarnating egos, and that individual stays in that state vary greatly, forty years *does* seem a remarkably short period after a full life-span. A recent inquiry to Editors of THEOSOPHY on this point was answered as follows:

We agree as to the likelihood of "an acceleration [of rebirths] going on in the present stage of Kali Yuga," if for no other reason than that the incessant wars of the western world since the Middle Ages have carried off an increasingly large number of egos who will need to get back into incarnation to make up for lost opportunities of living and learning. Then, too, the tremendous increase in the world population could be chiefly a result of the fact that nearly all egos would have a karmic obligation to be involved in experience during the time when the utmost in physical, psychic and mental contrasts occurs. Perhaps some such point is being reached at the present time, after which some sort of separation of the various groups and classes may take place under karmic law and the psychic confusion consequently lessen. We are always reminded of William Q. Judge's statement that in Kali Yuga is a time of great opportunity as well as a time of great trial.

As to the likelihood, however, of very recent reincarnations, one discovers that in theosophical literature another alternative is presented to that of the same entity returning in instances where psychic and physical memories of past existences stand out so sharply and clearly. In considering the description of "Shanti Devi" and "The Rebirth of Katsugoro" as recorded by Lafcadio Hearn (THEOSOPHY 26: 172, 224), the suggestion is that the psycho-astral complex of one departed soul, cut off while memories were still vivid, might be picked up and used by another soul coming to birth—presumably where a strong psychic kinship existed between the two egos.

FOREWARNED—FOREARMED

The need for theosophical explanations of this case is apparent when we recall that Mr. Bernstein's efforts are bent toward collecting *verifiable* data: every effort is being made to check unusual words and phrases, to locate places described, and to check vital statistics records in the localities mentioned. Toward that end, the article says, Funk and Wagnalls have hired "a team of investigators in Ireland—men who had no connection with Funk and Wagnalls and no interest in hypnotism or reincarnation. This independent group would run down every smallest statement Bridey made that was verifiable." Furthermore:

It was planned that, in the late fall of 1954, Funk and Wagnalls would publish a book about Bridey Murphy. Bernstein would write the first half of the story, and the findings of the Irish investigators would comprise the second half.

Morey and the editors were in agreement that, regardless of the results of the investigation—whether the facts backed up the strange memories of the hypnotized Mrs. S. or exposed her statements as mere dream-world fantasies—the book would be prepared.

Such a book might well be widely read, and might thereby provide Theosophists with many an opportunity to discuss both hypnotism and reincarnation.

EARTH'S CLIMATIC CHANGES

From *Time,* Sept. 27:

One of the mysteries of geology is why the earth's climate has changed. . . . At times, parts of the earth that are now cool had tropical climates, while parts now tropical were covered with ice. The obvious explanation is that the poles and the icecaps associated with them were then in different parts of the earth's surface, but this theory is hard to prove.

We may recall, here, H.P.B.'s statement that inversion of the poles has occurred three times (*S.D.* II, 436) and that the next inversion is due in "about 16,000 years" (*ibid.*, 331).

ASSERTED PROOF

A geophysicist of Cambridge University, Dr. K. M. Creer, believes that he has found proof of pole inversion, or at least of the shifting of the poles, by measuring the magnetism of ancient rocks, which tend to be magnetized by the earth's magnetic field. This magnetism, "though very feeble, is parallel to the magnetic field that formed it, pointing like a compass needle toward the magnetic pole." *Time* continues:

> When Dr. Creer measured the magnetism of ancient rocks, he found that it pointed every which way, sometimes toward places that are now near the earth's equator. Rocks of the same age generally pointed toward the same place, which Dr. Creer believes was the position of the north magnetic pole at the time the rocks were formed. About 700 million years ago, the pole was in Arizona. Then it moved to the Pacific, then to Japan and northward across eastern Siberia to its present position.

EXPLANATIONS

> None of this means, Dr. Creer points out, that the earth's axis of revolution has changed its direction in space. More likely, it has stayed put while the thin crust of the earth has slipped around the core, carrying different parts of the surface to the cold polar regions. Dr. Creer is not sure that the crust as a whole has moved. The continents may have drifted independently. By measuring the magnetism of more ancient rocks, he hopes to answer this question too.

This "slipping" of the earth's crust, however, does not seem to square with the explanation offered in *S.D.* II, 360:

> . . . They represented also the poles *inverted,* in consequence of the great inclination of the axis, bringing each time as a result the displacement of the Oceans, the submersion of the polar lands, and the consequent *upheaval* of new continents in the equatorial regions, and *vice versa.*